DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 994 RC 022 701

AUTHOR	Walters, Donald L.; Pickands, D. Morgan
TITLE	Problems of Rural School Administrators: Are They Complicated by the Multi-School Principalship?
PUB DATE	2000-10-00
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Rural Education Association (Charleston, SC, October 25-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Administrative Problems; *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; Educational Environment; Elementary Education; Elementary Schools; Job Satisfaction; *Principals; *Rural Schools; School Surveys; *Shared Resources and Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Dual Principalship; *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A study examined rural school administrators' perceptions of their jobs and how academic achievement and school climate were affected at rural schools that shared principals, compared to rural schools that had their own principal. Sixteen rural school administrators from across the nation were interviewed about their perceptions of their jobs, and data were gathered on academic achievement and teacher perceptions of school climate from 325 Pennsylvania rural elementary schools. Results indicate that administrators value interacting with students and teachers. They are pleased and proud when students are successful; they are frustrated and concerned when students misbehave or are unsuccessful. Rural administrators want to see firsthand what is happening and be able to respond to situations with a direct, personal touch. The principal's role is changing from the traditional directing role to one of facilitating involvement and collaboration. Data from a statewide test of fifth-grade math and reading showed that out of six comparisons between single-school and multischool principalships, five favored the multischool principalship, although only one showed a significant difference. School climate did not differ between single-school and multischool principalships. Graduate programs should provide at least one course on rural school administration. Multischool principals should counter loss of direct involvement by delegating and sharing accountability and responsibility with staff, students, parents, and the community. Appendices present the study population and student achievement and school climate instruments. (Contains 26 references.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 447 994

RURAL EDUCATION RESEARCH FORUM

Problems of Rural School Administrators: Are They Complicated by the Multi-School Principalship?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Donald L. Walters, Ed.D.
D. Morgan Pickands, Ed.D.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald L. Walters
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

National Rural Education Association Annual Meeting
October 25-28, 2000
Charleston, South Carolina

Contact person: Donald L. Walters
Phone: 215.204.6212
E-mail: dwalters@astro.temple.edu

Temple University
Dept. of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Philadelphia, PA 19122

RC 022701

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROBLEMS OF RURAL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS: ARE THEY COMPLICATED BY THE MULTI-SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP?

ABSTRACT

At the gateway to the new millennium, how do rural school administrators' perceptions of their jobs relate to student achievement and school climate? Of special interest is the multi-school principalship, including its advantages and disadvantages on these performance variables compared to the single-school principalship.

Interview responses from a national survey of rural administrators and test data from Pennsylvania rural elementary schools were analyzed. The data reveal that student achievement and school climate are not necessarily affected adversely by the multi-school principalship, but multi-school principals must be wary of setting unrealistic expectations for themselves. The role of principal is changing from that of directing to that of facilitating involvement and collaboration. Principals, therefore, must pursue ways to share accountability and responsibility with staff, students, parents, and the community.

PROBLEMS OF RURAL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS: ARE THEY COMPLICATED BY THE MULTI-SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP?

Introduction

Almost four out of every ten of the nation's 88,000 public schools are in rural or small town communities (U.S. Department of Education, 1998-99). Expectations for rural school administrators emphasize the importance of their becoming a part of the community and of focusing on people and relationships. The desired leadership style is one in which they are advised to move sincerely but slowly and to expect to work hard (Chalker, 1999). Are these expectations realistic in light of the problems facing rural school administrators at the gateway to the new millennium?

The Research Problem

This research relates the findings from a national survey of rural school administrators' perceptions of their jobs to data on student achievement and school climate in Pennsylvania rural elementary schools. Of special interest was whether rural schools which share a principal were disadvantaged on these performance variables in comparison to their counterparts which have their own principal. Is the standard of "one school, one principal" (NAESP, 1990, pp. 6, 30) essential for educational quality?

Four questions were posed to address the above problem: (1) How do rural school administrators see their jobs? (2) What are their vexing problems? (3) How do they cope with these problems? (4) Does the multi-school principalship complicate these problems?

Significance of the Study

As reported in the literature, school administrators have found their roles to be conflicted, ambiguous and harrowing. Rural school administrators do not differentiate job types, single or multi-school principalships; therefore, they view these situations with the same conflicts and expectations. The percentage, approximately 12% (NAESP, 1990), of multi-school principalships has not appreciably increased or decreased within the last ten years, but little attention is given specifically to them.

Pennsylvania is an excellent site for the study of rural schools in that it serves more rural students than any state except North Carolina and has multi-school principalships in approximately two-thirds of its rural elementary schools (Pickands, 1999). It is important, therefore, to investigate how the job of the rural school administrator is affected by the multi-school principalship. If rural districts are to justify multi-school principalships, then these schools should produce student achievement and foster a school climate equal to or better than single-school principalships.

Related Literature

To provide context for this research, a sample of related studies is reviewed. They describe rural schools and research findings pertaining to multi-school principalships, school climate, and student achievement.

Rural Schools

Characteristics of rural schools include geographic isolation, small size, pride of their values, and cultural center of the area. "Place value" is an important part of this equation. Haas and Nachtigal (2000) dedicated a chat room and a book (1998) to the value of place that the rural school has in the community. The rural school provides education for the students, but it also provides a central place for community activity and a way to disseminate common values. The rural school is an integral and intrinsic part of its sphere of influence.

Forty nine percent (7,104) of the 14,498 school districts in the United States serve fewer than one thousand students each. When classified by type of community, 38.7% (34,255) of the

nation's 88,519 schools are located in small towns, rural, or rural urban fringe areas. These schools account for 27.8% of the total public school enrollment (U.S. Department of Education, 1998-99).

Financial resources provided for rural schools often lag behind what other schools receive. A study of Pennsylvania school finance over a ten-year period examined differences in spending between the lowest spending and the highest spending districts. The lowest spending districts were all small towns and rural areas; the highest spending ones were in suburban or urban areas. The difference in spending per student remained at a 2:1 ratio across the ten years. The difference in wealth per student increased across the period to over 4:1. Moreover, the highest spending districts received nearly 1.5 times as much federal aid per student as did the lowest spending districts (Walters, 1996).

Multi-School Principalships

The phenomenon of the multi-school principalship, i.e., one principal assigned to more than one school, occurs most frequently in rural areas. Research concerning rural elementary school principals, however, has tended to treat the single-school and multi-school principalship as the same entity (for examples see Parker, 1981; Evans, 1991; Johnson, 1985). Studies specifically related to this phenomenon are reviewed below.

More similarities than differences have been found between single-school and multi-school principalships (Carr, 1987; Solow, 1995). No differences in the percentage of time single or dual school principals spend on evaluation and supervision have been reported (Brown, 1985). In a micro-ethnography of a dual principal school in New England, Cranswick (1983) found that a principal could be very effective in each school. The ideal multi-school principal would head two or more small schools with narrow grade spans, with younger students, team management and experienced support staff.

Other studies make a strong case for the single-school principalship. Dual school principals report a good deal of job dissatisfaction, job ambiguity, and role conflict (Andrews, 1995; Mortensen, 1983). These studies, however, considered the principal's perspective only and did not examine the effect of the dual principalship on school climate or student achievement.

School Climate and Student Achievement

Studies of multi-school principalships show little or no differences in teachers' perceptions of school climate or student achievement (Tillman, 1985). Teachers' lack of time, of support, of involvement, or of direction from the principal may, in fact, stimulate teachers to develop innovative ways to deal with the principalship--an outcome that has often been overlooked (Hargreaves, 1996; Stevens & Slavin, 1995).

A positive cyclical relationship exists among teacher leadership, principal leadership, commitment, and student achievement. Teachers may not want all of the duties of the principal, as sometimes occurs when the principal is not available. Nevertheless, teachers need to have a leadership role in forming programs and curriculum (Kushman, 1992).

Student achievement has been found to correlate directly with the quality of the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership skills. In schools where teachers perceived the principal as effective, student achievement was higher (Short, Greer, & Michael, 1991; Chiusolo, 1992). The relationship between the principal and teachers should be an intimate one that contributes positively to the morale of the staff. The relationship should foster collegiality and the common bond of providing an appropriate atmosphere to encourage learning and growth for all (Hoerr, 1996). Teachers' perceptions of school climate may help to frame the appropriate use of the multi-school principalship.

Methodology

A non-random, quota sample of sixteen rural school administrators from across the nation was interviewed about their perceptions of their jobs, the vexing problems they face, and their means of coping with those problems. The schools and districts represented were identified as rural by the participants. The districts ranged in size from 240 to over 10,000 students (a county district). The individual schools ranged in size from 240-740 students.

The interviews were conducted by individual professors who were members of the research team. A standard protocol was administered to each participant. Transcripts prepared from audiotapes were used to identify themes in the responses. These interviews were excerpted from the database of *A Thousand Voices from the Firing Line* (Kochan, Jackson, & Duke, 1999).

Data about student achievement and teacher perceptions of school climate were obtained for rural elementary schools in Pennsylvania from the Pennsylvania Department of Education. From a total of 396 schools identified as rural, 147 had their own principal and 249 shared a principal. The latter were defined as multi-school principalships, i.e., a principal assigned to two or more elementary schools. Ultimately, only those schools (N=325) which included both third and fifth grades and in which at least 90% of the students and faculty completed one or both instruments were used in the analysis. (See Appendix A.)

Achievement data in mathematics and reading for fifth graders and teacher perceptions were gathered from the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Tests developed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and administered annually. Data for each school for each of three years included the averaged score from the fifth grade reading test and the averaged score for the fifth grade math test as well as the averaged results of the faculty self-reporting questionnaire. Two dimensions of climate were extracted from the teachers' responses. One compared teacher perceptions about their relationship to the school and the head of the school; the other, perceptions of the classroom, staff, and professional development (Pickands, 1999). (See Appendix B.)

Results

1. How do rural school administrators see their jobs?

A broad range of problems were reported; administrators must "wear a lot of hats." Legal requirements and the push on standards have placed increased demands on administrators. The call for accountability for student learning is confounded by "more diversity in viewpoints to be considered." At the same time "people want more but see little relationship between what they want and what resources they are willing to provide."

Expectations for site-based decision making mean increased teacher and community involvement. Administrators "are not automatically the leaders; people question more." As a consequence, administrators perceive "lack of respect of administration, inside and outside the organization." They advised, "Learn to pass the ball; don't try to do it all . . . . Build trust and

confidence; establish a vision for the district." To be effective instructional leaders and change agents, administrators must bring more political and public relations skills to their jobs.

Good feelings about the job of administrator were most frequently tied to some interaction with students and personnel. To be in buildings, to visit classrooms, and to see learning taking place are very rewarding. Seeing student success, that kids are happy, and that people are doing their jobs with a smile give great satisfaction to administrators. Helping someone work through a problem, completing a project successfully, and getting the paperwork done were also cited as providing job satisfaction.

Bad feelings about the job were associated with student misbehavior and lack of student success. Having to focus on non-instructional issues and financial problems were disconcerting. By far, however, most expressions of bad feelings pertain to "unresolved problems with people." Dealing with people who are not happy or making a decision that upsets them lead to unpleasant feelings for administrators. As one put it, "People were frustrated I wasn't able to make the system work so that they could do what they wanted to do." Sources of bad feelings ranged from "little nitty gritty problems" to "teachers berating students and always blaming someone."

2. What do rural school administrators report are the vexing problems facing them?

Unsuccessful students and students who become discipline problems are especially vexing to administrators. That many children live in poverty, live in single parent or no parent homes, and are often on their own with little parental supervision create a frustrating environment. Moreover, administrators report that they must make "teachers aware that their job includes student motivation." "Getting teachers and parents to set high expectations for kids" needs continuous effort. "How to make school staff realize they can solve problems and make a difference" is especially troubling.

Public criticism of schools and lack of financial resources while surrounded with numerous laws, rules, and regulations lead to a sense of futility. Overcrowding, violence, out-of-date programs, and obsolete equipment appear to be ignored by those who hold the resources for improving schools. How to get the school's message across to everyone is difficult to communicate. Administrators are challenged to handle many different people's beliefs, complicated by hidden agenda and politicized issues, about the way the school should be run.

They feel barraged with demands from individual school board members and the community. One administrator bemoaned, "People don't want to understand; they have their own agenda."

Dealing with change remains a vexing problem. How "to replace fire fighting by seeing the whole picture" is essential. Despite working long hours, administrators feel they are expected "to be expert at more things than a person can be." Another expressed frustration at the inability to address vexing problems by "not being able to control the things I would like to control."

3. How do rural school administrators report coping with these problems?

High on the list of coping activities is simply being visible in the school and in the community. A sample of comments follows:

> "I want to know what is going on in my building . . . . You can't do that if you are in the office half of the day."
>
> "I still drink coffee at different places every morning to be able to talk with different groups."
>
> "Try to be in lots of places where people are--letting them get to know you, building trust."

Administrators seek to set the tone, to model what they want teachers and others to do. They consult with others, get input from trusted colleagues, and make use of resource persons. They conduct one-on-one discussions and bring people together to hash out differences.

A major coping strategy is to keep the school board, teachers, and community informed about problems. One administrator advised, "Admit when you have problems, do not cover up; explain what you are doing." Use a planning mode: gather information, get people involved, build their understanding. Perhaps the most salient advice from one administrator to other administrators for coping with vexing problems was: "Learn not to take things personally!"

4. Does the multi-school principalship complicate these problems?

According to the National Association of Elementary School Principals (1990), one attribute of a quality school district is a principal for each school. Nevertheless, many rural elementary school principals find themselves responsible for two or more schools at different

sites. This circumstance might be expected to exacerbate the problems cited in the interviews. Indeed, multi-school principals report a good deal of job dissatisfaction, job ambiguity, and role conflict (Andrews, 1995; Mortensen, 1983). But do these feelings reflect adverse results on student achievement and teacher relationships, two major concerns reported in the interviews?

The data for fifth grade math and reading scores in rural Pennsylvania schools yielded only one significant difference, and that favored multi-school principalships in one year for mathematics ($t=-3.02$, $df=306$, $p<.01$). All other comparisons (see Table 1) yielded no significant differences between single-school and multi-school principalships. However, of the six comparisons (two subjects X three years), five, including the one significant difference, favored the multi-school principalships. Student achievement as measured by the statewide test was clearly as good if not better in multi-school principalship circumstances as in single-principalship schools.

The results for school climate (see Table 2) as perceived by teachers yielded even smaller differences. No comparison for either measure of climate produced a significant difference in any of the three years. No trend was evident as the six differences were evenly divided between the two principalship circumstances. Teacher perceptions of school climate were not negatively affected by the absence of a full-time principal in the school.

Table 1. School Achievement Differences between Single-School and Multi-School Elementary Principalships

Year	Single-School Principalship		Multi-School Principalship		df	t
Subject	Mean	N	Mean	N		
1994						
Reading	1296	48	1303	113	159	-0.64
Mathematics	1287	48	1292	113	159	-0.45
1995						
Reading	1306	112	1316	196	306	-1.20
Mathematics	1284	112	1305	196	306	-3.02**
1996						
Reading	1306	111	1297	199	308	1.18
Mathematics	1290	111	1292	199	308	-0.15

**p<.01

Table 2. School Climate Differences between Single-School and Multi-School Elementary Principalships

Year Subject	Single-School Principalship Mean	N	Multi-School Principalship Mean	N	df	t
1994						
Climate 1	0.98	38	1.01	99	135	-0.46
Climate 2	0.55	38	.54	99	135	0.28
1995						
Climate 1	1.02	78	1.02	136	212	0.09
Climate 2	0.55	78	.52	136	212	0.93
1996						
Climate 1	1.01	51	1.10	98	147	-1.69
Climate 2	0.52	51	.56	98	147	-0.75

Discussion

School administrators value interacting with students and teachers. They are pleased and proud when students are successful; they are frustrated and concerned when students misbehave or are unsuccessful. Administrators want to be visible in their schools and in their communities. Seeing first hand what is happening and being able to respond to situations with a direct, personal touch are high priorities for rural administrators.

The principal's role is changing from the traditional directing role to one of facilitating involvement and collaboration. Confronted with conflicting viewpoints, unable to resolve problems to others' satisfaction, constrained by laws and regulations, and handcuffed by lack of resources, rural school administrators express feelings of futility and helplessness. Although these expressions may not be unique to rural administrators, they are poignant reminders that the wistful image of rural schools persisting in halcyon days of bliss, if they ever did, is a myth.

Graduate preparation programs should devote at least one offering specifically on rural school administration, especially the multi-school principalship. Continuing professional development should be provided to assist persons in these roles. These administrators are likely

to have more demands placed on them than their counterparts in single schools. They need to understand their job expectations and how to set realistic goals for themselves.

Multi-school principals must be wary of expectations to be omnipresent administrators. Loss of direct involvement may be countered by delegating responsibilities and empowering teachers and parents to become accountable partners in the school enterprise. The Pennsylvania data show that student achievement and school climate as perceived by teachers are not automatically worse in multi-school principalships. They reinforce "that shared responsibility among parents, staff, and teachers is possible in small, rural schools; and when it is achieved, schools become healthy environments for our children" (Chalker, 1999, p. 147).

REFERENCES

Andrews, R. R. (1995). *Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction among single school and dual school elementary principals in New Jersey.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Brown, G. (1985). A study of the dual principalship: Optimizing conditions for the implementation and operation (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2320A.

Carr. J. (1987). *Effects of structural complexity on administrative role demands.* ERIC, ED 283 280.

Chalker, D. M. (Ed.). (1999). *Leadership for rural schools: Lessons for all educators.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.

Chiusolo, J. L. (1992). An analysis of political games played in schools (Doctoral dissertation Northern Illinois University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 387A.

Cranswick, D. B. (1983). *The effect of the dual school principal on the educational setting: A micro-ethnography.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Evans, L. C. (1991). Coping mechanisms employed by principals in small, rural Georgia schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 3137A.

Haas, T. & Nachtigal, P. (2000). "Chat Room Place-Value." Retrieved May 17, 2000 from the World Wide Web http://www.ael.org.

Haas, T. & Nachtigal, P. (1998). *Place value: An educator's guide to good literature on rural lifeways, environments, and purposes of education.* Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Hargreaves, A. (1996). Revisiting voice. Educational Researcher 25 (1), 12-19.

Hoerr, T. R. (1996). Collegiality: A new way to define instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappan 77 (5), 380.

Hojak, J. (1993). *The effective schools project.* Harrisburg: PDE Division of Communications and Mathematics.

Johnson, R. A. (1985). Characteristics and techniques of rural elementary school principals in northern Idaho (behaviors, skills, traits) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 1463A.

Kochan, F. K., Jackson, B. L., & Duke, D. L. (Eds.). (1999). *A thousand voices from the firing line: A study of educational leaders, their jobs, their preparation, and the problems they face.* Columbia, MO: The University Council for Educational Administration.

Kohr, R. L. (1995). *The Pennsylvania Teacher Questionnaire: Version implemented in the assessments of 1992-1995.* Harrisburg: PDE Department of Reports and Evaluation.

Kushman, J. W. (1992). The organizational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. Educational Administration Quarterly 28 (1), 5-42.

Mortensen, C. N. (1983). *A comparative analysis of the responsibility of one and two building elementary school principals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1990). *Standards for quality elementary and middle schools: Kindergarten through eighth grade* (revised ed.). Alexandria, VA: The Association.

Parker, L. E. (1981). A study of the rural elementary principal in Alabama and Georgia (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3816A.

Pickands, D. M. (1999). *The relationship of the type of principal assignment in rural Pennsylvania elementary schools to school climate and student achievement.* Doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Short, P. M., Greer, T. J., & Michael, R. (1991). Restructuring schools through empowerment: Facilitating the process. Journal of School Leadership 1(2), 128.

Solow, S. S. (1995). The nature and scope of curricular roles and responsibilities of elementary principals: A case study of responsibilities of the elementary principal's district-wide curriculum leadership functions (Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 1616A.

Stevens, R. J. & Slavin, R. E. (1995). The cooperative elementary school: Effects on students' achievement, attitudes, and social relations. American Educational Research Journal 32 (2), 321-351.

Tillman, R. B. (1985). *Instructional leadership style: Perceptions of an elementary principal and teachers (case study)*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (1998-99). *Common core of data (CCD)*. Retrieved September 15, 2000 from the World Wide Web: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/quarterly/summer/2feat/q2-5.html#Table-3.

Walters, D. L. (1996). *Rural schools: Resource inequalities persist*. National Conference on Creating the Quality School, Oklahoma City. ERIC, ED 401 057.

APPENDIX A

Pennsylvania Rural School Study Population

The population for the quantitative segment included all Pennsylvania rural schools which contained third and fifth grade. On September 26, 1996 there were 1,797 elementary schools containing third and fifth in Pennsylvania. Statewide, 529 of those 1,797 were multi-school principalships, 249 of those schools were rural. Altogether, there were 396 rural elementary schools in Pennsylvania.

Three hundred twenty-five (325) schools had the required configuration, third to fifth grade. Seventy-one elementary schools of the 396 did not include both grades. The instruments abbreviated in Table 3 are the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Test as PSSAT and the Pennsylvania System of State Assessment Teacher Questionnaire as PTQ.

Table 3. Population Sizes Each Year and Tests Taken

Year		1994	1995	1996
Unshared Principal	PSSAT and PTQ	38	78	51
Unshared Principal	PSSAT	10	34	60
Shared Principal	PSSAT and PTQ	99	136	98
Shared Principal	PSSAT	14	60	101
Total Qualified Schools*		161	308	310

*Three hundred ninety-six four digit coded schools were requested from the state. Of those schools requested, 71 rural schools did not include both the third and fifth grade. Three observations were missing in one or more of the years of data for three schools, as they were non-existent for one or more of the years. Seven schools changed their configuration during one or more of their years. Any observations that were not complete were not included in the calculations. Hence, one hundred sixty-one schools for 1994, three hundred eight schools for 1995, and three hundred ten schools for 1996 were included in calculations for the respective years. In 1994, only one hundred sixty seven rural schools participated, six were not the required configuration, as the mandate only required one-third of Pennsylvania school districts to participate in the testing.

APPENDIX B

Student Achievement and School Climate Instruments

There were two instruments included in this segment of the study. One was a faculty survey; the other, a student assessment test. The instrument names are abbreviated: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Test is PSSAT; Pennsylvania System of State Assessment Teacher Questionnaire is PTQ.

PTQ is a self-reporting instrument completed by members of the faculty. Questions one, two, and four through eight are general information questions; question three is a subjective satisfaction question about the individual's relationship with parents and parent groups.

Each question 9-56 has a four-point choice on a Likert-like response scale. The mean for each question could range from 1-4; one being the most positive response. These questions were statements about how often the students, teachers, and administrator employ positive educational techniques. Questions 49-56 deal with the relationship of the respondent to the school climate and their professional development (Kohr, 1995).

The possible range of the two climate measures were averages of the questions subtracted from constants. Thus, for them the low number represent unfavorable responses and high numbers represent favorable ones. The range of means for Climate 1 could be +2 to -2 with 0 as neutral. The range of means for Climate 2 could be + 1 ½ to -1 ½ with 0 as neutral. Positive numbers portray a positive school climate.

The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Test (PSSAT) for fifth grade was the achievement measure used. For each test, reading and mathematics, the range of scores is 1000-1600; the state mean is set at 1300. Grade level teachers submitted questions for these tests and a statewide group of teachers established the questions for the instrument. The PSSAT has been deemed to be valid and reliable (Hojak, 1993).

After the testing dates each year, the school receives a profile and a summary of the findings. These school profiles have become public record and as of 1999 are on the Internet at www.pde.psu.edu under School Profiles. One-third of the public school population in grades five, eight, and eleven in Pennsylvania took the test in 1993. By 1995, all working school districts (500) in Pennsylvania participated in the PSSAT.